

the report is comprised of 3 pages

1. [Scholarship Defined](#)
2. [Methodology](#)
3. [Reality Check](#)

The domain scope of the "Faculty Scholarship" working group strongly incorporates the definitions of scholarship as put forth on the Ithaca College web site. All scholarship types are included in the domain scope but The Scholarship of Teaching must be distinguished from teaching. Teaching materials, or curriculum driven materials, are excluded from the domain scope as it is covered by other working groups.

These scholarship types are briefly described below with examples of relevant materials that could flow into a content management system. Following the listing, a table is presented of functionality envisioned as "likely required" before faculty at Wesleyan were contacted.

[Faculty Handbook Definition of Scholarship](#)

http://www.ithaca.edu/cfe/scholarship_scholarshipdef.htm

1. The Scholarship of Discovery (basic or original)
 - discovery or collection of new information
 - free inquiry, disciplined investigation, and the pursuit of knowledge
 - for example: discovery of unknown physical phenomena, highly original empirical research using quantitative techniques
2. The Scholarship of Integration (interdisciplinary, interpretative)
 - seeks to better understand existing knowledge
 - placing known information into broader contexts
 - for example: economic or psychological analysis, review essays
3. The Scholarship of Application (applied within disciplines)
 - relate the knowledge in one's field to the affairs of society
 - crafting solutions to social problems
 - for example: articles and books examining the legal, economic, or ethical implications
4. The Scholarship of Teaching (not the act of instruction)
 - related to pedagogical practices (development, innovations)

- improve the teaching and advising of students (workshops, research)
- for example: publications about pedagogy, workshops on innovative teaching methods

5. The Scholarship of Artistic Endeavor

- activities which are directly related to the creative process
- primarily in the fine or applied arts
- for example: stage presentations, art exhibits, creation of new art forms or new techniques within an art form

Envisioned Functionality

So what should a content management system provide across these scholarship types?

Based on the scholarship types above, the following list of functionality was brainstormed together prior to contacting Wesleyan faculty. The heard/not heard columns reflect the post-contact status of the items.

	heard	not heard
diverse set of users, skill sets		
web front end for loading item, collections		X
batch loading for large collections, power users		X
control of gui, show "my stuff" only	X	
faculty-centric, not project based	X	
delegation of tasks to others		
manage user access by item, folder	X	
manage group access by item, folder		X
manage tasks by user/groups		X
simple workflow		X
complex workflow		X
describe materials loaded, find & retrieve		
copyrighted materials should be loadable (while access protected)	X	
simple metadata	X	
complex or disciplinary metadata w/wo custom dictionaries		X
indexing, searching		X
publish metadata of selected items, collections only		X
load metadata into university metadata distributors		X
assign doi & persistent uri	X	
manage materials loaded		

check-in, check-out of works in progress	x	
export items, collections		x
migrate items, collections from archive to/fro active (central server / laptop)	x	
integrity checks (md5 check sums, execute QA/QC programs)		x
manage quotas within faculty area (multiple projects)		x
dis/enable subscription services (by folders, projects)		x
link to lots of other resources (bb, eres, personal web site)		x
miscellaneous wish list		
allow access after wesleyan departure, retirement	x	
allow non-wesleyan access	x	
build personal web site from items, collections (research portfolio)	x	
make content available to streaming server		x
scientific dataset format support (open and proprietary)		x

[Onwards to Methodology](#)

MAILING BY DIVISION

Subject: Content Management at Wesleyan

This project will attempt to analyze existing content management practices and to develop a set of recommended changes or initiatives for our campus. More information can be found at:

http://www.wesleyan.edu/atr/content_management/index.html

The "Faculty Scholarship" group will collect information on current practices regarding content management as it relates to scholarship materials. These materials are defined as all input used to generate scholarship outputs (accessed, processed, reviewed, etc). The materials may be part of quantitative and/or qualitative research, interpretative works, editorials, contract deliverables, performances, exhibitions, conferences, art works, etc. Specifically excluded from this list are teaching/curriculum driven materials as they are covered by other working groups.

The working group is interested in getting your input on what currently works, and what does not and needs improvement so that managing such materials by the faculty becomes more effective. More specifically we are looking for information on how materials are stored, accessed, preserved or backed up? Are the materials searchable, easily retrieved, in desired formats? Are the materials

easily shared, protected, and identified?

You may want to consider all the information on your desktop workstation, perhaps personal laptop, home computers, in file systems such as dragon's "rspace", "/datahome", "/share" , on cdroms, dvds, tapes, on web sites, databases -- the list can be very long -- and the way you currently manage all these materials. Is it the case that too much time is spent in managing these materials? What kinds of tools/functions would make these tasks easier?

If you are interested in sharing your opinion, please contact me directly via email at hmeij@wesleyan.edu or via phone (x3783). I will be happy to meet you in your office for about thirty minutes to discuss these issues.

-Henk

Due to the low response level, the comments have been incorporated into the comments of the phone/office interviews listed below in table format. A project based approach may have been more appropriate, however it also indicates that "power users" have no interest, don't have time, and/or envision no benefits in responding.

	division			
	div1 A&H	div2 SocSci	div3 NSM	
response	0	1	0	1
no response	100	80	86	266
	100	81	86	267

INTERVIEW BY DIVISION

Phone Call:

ITS & LIBRARY are gathering opinions regarding a content management system that would allow faculty to manage their digital scholarship materials. If you have an interest in such please return this call so we may set up an appointment for a 30 min interview. If you are not interested, or just want to decline, i'd like to know that too.

The content management system would consolidate where and how faculty store materials, manage access, publish and share content, etc from a diverse set of locations such as desktops, shared file systems, conference materials etc.

x3783

-Henk

- design: ten percent random sample, without replacement, finite population

- rules: no visiting faculty, no div 0/9 (??? what are those), substitutions allowed
- target: 30 min in-office chat, or a phone interview during spring break
- attempt to collect reasons for declines

	division			
	div1 AH	div2 SS	div3 NSM	
accepted	1	4	1	6
declined	1	0	2	3
ignored	7	4	5	16
	9	8	8	25

Responses received in the interviews.

The responses have been grouped as much as possible into similar categories. The "weight" column serves as a relative measure on the number of times the statement in question was heard (default=1). Of these interviews, one was excellent and "on the mark", meaning that faculty had figured out what s/he desired as outcome and how to leverage it into personal benefits. Most interviews circled the notion that "if none of my time was involved" i'd be interested "if a scholarly/research personal web site" came out of it.

On the issue of current weaknesses in our environment, the plethora of pathways to store, share, and transmit files was mentioned as the single stumbling block. The declining voices were unified in their opposition to "yet another administrative layer".

Statements regarding scholarship activities & materials	weight
Shows interest in ...	
self-archiving (but not in a central repository, read on desktop, in office, at home)	3
self-archiving in an institutional repository	2
linking of resources rather than copying to multiple locations	1
indexing & searching not needed	3
indexing and searching needed	1
professionally showcasing work via web	1
generating persistent handles (DOI)	1
merging office & home work environments	2
Collects materials from ...	
personal, professional contacts	3
google/scholar searches	3
journals, hard copy or online	4

wesleyan theses (inside dept, on shelf)	1
does not collect student papers	3
does collect student materials & collaborates (pictures)	1
datasets from CDs	1
custom programs generating custom data	1
Stores materials in ...	
prints out digital files, and stores in office	2
in head	1
endnote for biblio	1
file cabinet	
jump drive	
does not read on computer screens	1
reads & marks up digital materials (versioning)	1
folders on desktop, by date & place	5
copies current work between desktop and laptop	2
avoids dragon altogether	1
email (stores materials in inbox for office & home access)	
Shares materials via	
email	4
CV, posted on web	1
G Drive (includes external access)	1
Wish List ...	
a better personal web site (should require none of my time)	2
for the university to capture & present scholarly output of colleagues	2
better workflow between lab and desktop(s)	1
outside access to IR like system (outsources currently)	1
a "my library" content management personal repository	1
Considers him/her-self to be ...	
self-sufficient	2
independent of administration	2
not interested	1
not a big user of	2

[Onwards to Reality Check](#)

Reality Check. Institutional Repository?

- overwhelming lack of response to list mailing
- absence of any responses from "power users" or large projects

These points do not bode well for institutional repositories were the model of self-archiving and self-publishing form the core of repositories' activities. In fact, this stands quite opposite an initiative like Cornell's faculty body:

(Ithaca, NY, May 17, 2005) The Cornell University Faculty Senate endorsed a resolution concerning scholarly publishing at its meeting on May 11, 2005.

The resolution, introduced by the University Faculty Library Board, responds to the increasingly excessive prices of some scholarly publications and encourages the open access publication of scholarship.

If the model "by the faculty, for the faculty" does not work, perhaps a project based approach is better suited for Wesleyan.

- faculty operate independently
- faculty are self-sufficient
- no interest in another administrative layer

These opinions from the contacted faculty out of the random sample are perhaps overstated, but the many declines (in addition to the ignored phone calls) speak for themselves. However, among the responses some interesting patterns developed.

Reality Check. Content Management?

There is content management "by the faculty, for the faculty" at Wesleyan. It is comprised of the conglomerate of desktop computers with folders and files labeled in some fashion. It's diverse, decentralized, can not be searched, and extremely personal. For each "instance", it is also replicated between home and office, with a variety of methods used in moving information between the two (frequently relies email).

The type of materials in these instances are primarily working papers and drafts but also includes full backups of data. A vast amount of information collected at Olin Library in books & journals is copied to these instances. There is a strong interest in composing out of these instances a "scholarly/research portfolio" to meet the desire for a "personal web site".

This has some implications:

- copyrighted materials are and should be included in content management
- only a small fraction of the materials is appropriate for public consumption
- there is no work flow
- huge requirement for material migration between office, home and other locations
- rights/access management is simple, owner only
- huge need for check-in/check-out and versioning functionality

These requirements would seriously dwindle the number of content management vendors that could provide such functionality. One faculty member summed it up best:

a content management system for me should allow me to create my own library with similar functionality offered by the Olin Library, bring all services of Olin to "mylibrary", and be within my reach at all times.

Interesting concept. For more information consult the My Library resource projects listed below. The consolidation of participating faculty "my libraries" into a federated institutional system, but with local controls, then emerges as the institutional repository of faculty scholarship materials.

Short Term and Long Term Recommendations?

Short term:

- develop a comprehensive overview of the "how, where and what" pathways are currently available to faculty regarding storing materials
- perhaps develop an application that generates a "scholarly/research personal web site" using some simple templates (or find an open source way to provide this service like the Research Page at the University of Rochester: [example](#))

Long Term:

- evaluate the "mylibrary" projects approach
- evaluate software that would allow a federated approach to content management (perhaps look at HarvestHive Road again, departmental hives with feeds to an institutional hive?)
- tightly couple any content management functionality to faculty usage patterns of Wesleyan libraries
- offer any content management functionality as a "service" to get faculty in the door

Resources

[Partnering with Faculty to Enhance Scholarly Communication](#)

[Understanding Faculty to Improve Content Recruitment for Institutional Repositories](#)

[Cornell University Faculty Senate Endorses Resolution on Open Access and Scholarly Communication](#)

[The Case for Institutional Repositories: A SPARC Position Paper](#)

[University of Maine: Institutional Repository: Faculty Survey](#)

[Library Journal - The Repository Adventure](#)

[My Library use at Virginia Commonwealth University \(VCU\)](#)

[Other My Library Projects](#)

[Publisher copyright policies & self-archiving: the SHERPA/ROMEEO list](#)

[cogdogblog: Repository Folly...](#)